



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/536,053	03/27/2000	Michael K. Just	0500.9912151	5651

23418 7590 11/21/2005

VEDDER PRICE KAUFMAN & KAMMHOLZ
222 N. LASALLE STREET
CHICAGO, IL 60601

EXAMINER

ZAND, KAMBIZ

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2132

DATE MAILED: 11/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/536,053	Applicant(s) JUST, MICHAEL K.	
	Examiner Kambiz Zand	Art Unit 2132	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 September 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 9-15, 17-26, 28-35, 37, 38 and 40-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 40-44 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 20-26, 29-35 and 38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 9, 11, 13, 15, 19, 28 and 37 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 March 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this section can be found in the prior office action.
2. The prior office actions are incorporated herein by reference. In particular, the observations with respect to claim language, and response to previously presented arguments.
3. Claims 8, 16, 27, 36 and 39 have been canceled.
4. Claims 1-7, 9-15, 17-26, 28-35, 37-38 and 40-44 are pending.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 09/19/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive with respect to independent claims.

As per applicant's arguments with respect to claims 38 and 17, examiner makes the following remarks:

- a) examiner has not read added limitations to the claims. All limitation of claim 38 has been addressed below. added features disclosed by the references in the last office action are irrelevant if all limitation of a claim being addressed.
- b) As per "updating.." limitation in claim 17, such process of mapping already addressed by the reference as disclosed below. Act of updating is nothing but repeat of the same process disclosed by the references.

6. Examiner however has withdrawn the rejection of claims 9, 11, 13, 15, 19, 28 and 37 in the light of applicants other arguments; and further in view of the specification and review of the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. **Claims 1-7, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 20-25 and 29-35** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan et al (2002/0019941 A1) in view of Schmeidler et al. (6,763,370 B1); and further in view of Bisbee et al (6,367,013 B1).

As per claims 1, 17, 20 and 29 Chan et al discloses the determination of a digital signature verification error (see page 8, second column, third paragraph, page 9, first column, first paragraph, and page 10, first column, second paragraph) and the generation of a digital signature verification map (see page 8, first column, third paragraph and page 9, second column, third and fourth paragraphs) but do not explicitly disclose association of the digital signature with corresponding public key (generating digital signature using public key). However Schmeidler et al. (6,763,370 B1) disclose association of the digital signature with corresponding public key (generating digital signature using public key) see col.26, lines 55-59). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize Schmeidler's public key digital signature algorithm in Chan's method, apparatus and storage medium signature verification error detection in order to provide security to protect the value of

Art Unit: 2132

the content and prevents unauthorized use and copying thereof (see scmeidler col.2, lines 21-23). Chan et al in view of Schmeidler et al do not disclose received message header identifier association with public key, digital signature entity and the mapping. However Bisbee et al (6,367,013 B1) disclose header identifier association with public key, digital signature entity and the mapping (see fig.1a,23A4a and 5a and associated texts). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize Bisbee et al 's digital signature chaining in chan's Chan's method, apparatus and storage medium signature verification error detection in view of Schmeidler's public key digital signature algorithm in order to re-validate e-original object a current time stamp and digital signature and current authentication certificate.

As per claims 2, 5, 21 , 24, 30, and 33, in addition to the teachings applied above, Chan et al discloses the storage, receipt, and digital signature verification map update Page 9 of at least one acceptable message header identifier, which becomes a map entry (see page 8, first column, third paragraph, last sentence and page 10, first column, first and second paragraphs).

As per claims 3, 22, and 31, in addition to the teachings applied above, Chan et al discloses that the generation step includes mapping the plurality of acceptable message header identifiers on a per certificate subject identification basis (see page 8, first column, third paragraph).

As per claims 4, 10, 12, 18, 23, and 32, in addition to the teachings applied above, Chan et al discloses the verification of a digital signature associated with received message information (see page 8, second column, third paragraph', page 9, first column, first paragraph, page 9, second column, third paragraph, and page 10, first column, second paragraph).

As per claims 6, 14, 25, and 34, in addition to the teachings applied above, Chan et al discloses that the message header identifier includes at least one of data representing a sender's email address, telephone number, and unit identifier (page 8, first column, third paragraph; page 9, second column, second paragraph; and page 9, second column, third paragraph, second sentence).

As per claim 7, 26 and 35 Chan et al (2002/0019941 A1) in view of Schmeidler et al. (6,763,370 B1) discloses the determination of a digital signature verification error (see page 8, second column, third paragraph', page 9, first column, first paragraph', and page 10, first column, second paragraph) and the generation of a digital signature verification map (see page 8, first column, third paragraph and page 9, second column, third and fourth paragraphs). Chan et al also discloses the storage, receipt, and digital signature verification map update of at least Page 11 one acceptable message header identifier, which becomes a map entry (see page 8, first column, third paragraph, last sentence and page 10, first column, first and second paragraphs). Chan et al additionally discloses the verification of a digital signature associated with received

Art Unit: 2132

message information (see page 8, second column, third paragraph; page 9, first column, first paragraph', page 9, second column, third paragraph, and page 10, first column, second paragraph). Chan et al also discloses that the determination of a digital signature verification error includes the comparison of a public key certificate identifier with the message header identifier (see page 8, second column, third paragraph), the generation of a mismatch notification (see "appropriate error code" on page 8, second column, third paragraph, second sentence), and the verification of a digital signature based on a verification key associated with the public key certificate identifier (See the certificate of the stated message source and SID based on this certificate on page 8, first column, third paragraph', page 8, second column, third paragraph; and page 9, first column, first paragraph. Also see the digital signature of the message that ensures the authenticity of the message source and has a verification key ensured by the above certificate on page 9, second column, third paragraph and page 10, first column, second paragraph.). Chan et al fails to expressly disclose the digital signature of the digital signature verification map. However, Chan et al does disclose the digital signature of an email message to ensure that the message is trustworthy, that it originates from the trusted

Page 12 message sender listed in the "from" field (see page 9, second column, third paragraph). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Chan et al by applying Chan et al's signature technique to the digital signature verification map ("restricted token") containing the acceptable message header identifiers ("restricted SIDs"). One of

ordinary skill in the art would have motivated to do in order to ensure that modifications to the digital signature verification map originate from a trustworthy source (see page 9, second column, third paragraph, second sentence).

8. **Claim 38** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan et al (US20020019941A1) in view of Schmeidler et al. (6,763,370 B1) and further in view of Bisbee et al (6,367,013 B1) as applied to claims 1 , 10, 20, and 29 above, and further in view of Cooper et al (US006052442A).

As per claim 38 Chan et al discloses the determination of a digital signature verification error (see Chan et al--page 8, second column, third paragraph', page 9, first column, first paragraph', and page 10, first column, second paragraph) and the generation of a digital signature verification map (see Chan et al--page 8, first column, third paragraph and page 9, second column, third and fourth paragraphs). Chan et al also discloses the storage, receipt, and digital signature verification map update of at least one acceptable message header identifier, which becomes a map entry (see Chan et al--page 8, first column, third paragraph, last sentence and page 10, first column, first and second paragraphs). Chan et al additionally discloses the verification of a digital signature associated with received message information (see Chan et al--page 8, second column, third paragraph', page 9, first column, first paragraph; page 9, second column, third paragraph', and page 10, first Page 13 column, second paragraph). Chan et al fails to expressly disclose the generation of a trusted alias map and the display of at least one

subject alias. However, Cooper et al discloses these features (see the directory "t'display" and l'mnemonic tag" in Cooper et al--page 9, first column, ll second and sixth paragraphs and column 10, first paragraph).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Chan et al in view of Schmeidler by generating a trusted alias map relating Chan et al's URLs or sender email addresses to corresponding mnemonic aliases and by displaying these aliases in place of the same URLs and sender email addresses.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to facilitate the identification of Chan et al's message sources in view of Schmeidler.

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 40-44 are allowed.

10. Claims 9, 11, 13, 15, 28 and 37 would be allowable if rewritten to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

11. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 2132

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kambiz Zand whose telephone number is (571) 272-3811. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (8:00-5:00). If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on (571) 272-3799. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 571-272-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197

(toll-free).

Kambiz Zand

11/15/2005

AU 2132